

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Figs. 17 and 18 and replaces the original sheet with Figs. 17-18.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4 and 6 are amended, claim 3 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein, and claim 7 is added. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action objects to the drawings for not properly designating the prior art. Replacement Drawings of Figs. 17 and 18 have been provided with a legend designating such as prior art. It is thus respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims are amended to overcome the rejection. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Publication No. US2004/0169993 (Nakamura). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nakamura does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Nakamura is a printed publication and as such, §102(b) requires that the invention be described more than one year prior to the date of application for patent. The above-referenced application was filed on November 20, 2003 and claims a priority date before that date. Nakamura, published on September 2, 2004, after the filing date of the present application does not qualify as prior art under §102(b). Moreover, even if Nakamura were prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Nakamura fails to disclose or suggest the vehicle-installed relay box wherein each of the relay elements to be installed in the installation socket are configured to have the same outer shape and outer dimensions, as recited in independent claim 1.

Nakamura teaches an electric junction box with a covering member 24 and relay units (22, 23) that are detachably attached to the covering member 24 having one or plural kinds of relay units (ABSTRACT). As shown in Fig. 1, the relay units (22, 23) have the same width but the relay units (22, 23) do not have the same outer shape or outer dimensions. Relay unit

23 is longer than relay unit 22 (Fig. 1, [0048]). In this way, Nakamura fails to disclose or suggest all of the features listed in the claims. It is thus respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nakamura and U.S. Publication No. US2004/0080214 (Metlitzky). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Metlitzky teaches a plug-in replacement relay for automotive use incorporating a security system to control the actuation of the relay. Thus, Metlitzky fails to cure deficiencies in Nakamura in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claim 4, including the limitations of independent claim 1.

For the reasons discussed above, Nakamura and Metlitzky fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1. It is thus respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. Moreover, claim 7, at least for its dependence on claim 1, is also allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2 and 4-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Brent M. Dougal
Registration No. 58,449

JAO:BMD/gck

Date: August 10, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
